# THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. VIII. JULY, 1928. No. 7.

## The Means of Grace.

Translated from Dr. E. Preuss's *Die Lehre von der Rechtfertigung*, Part IV.

The REV. JUL. A. FRIEDRICH, Iowa City, Iowa.

"Although the work of redemption was accomplished on the cross and forgiveness of sin acquired, yet it cannot come to us in any other way than through the Word. For what would we otherwise know about it that such a thing was accomplished or was to be given us if it were not presented by preaching, or the oral Word? . . . Or how can they apprehend and appropriate to themselves the forgiveness except they lay hold of, and believe, the Scriptures and the Gospel?" (Large Catechism. *Triglotta,* 759.) Therefore Paul calls the preached Word the means of salvation. 1 Cor. 15, 1. 2. But if it brings us salvation, it also brings us forgiveness; for salvation and forgiveness are the same thing. Yes, the Lord directly regards His Word as the bearer of His all-sufficient merits. For instead of saying: "Ye are clean through the obedience by which I made satisfaction to the Father," He says: "Ye are clean through the Word which I have spoken unto you." John 15, 3.

But where there is forgiveness through the merits of Christ, there is life. Titus 3, 7; Rom. 6, 20. [*Note.* — "For where there is forgiveness of sins, there is also life and salvation." Small Catechism. *Triglotta,* 557.] Therefore the Lord also calls His Word the bearer of life. John 5, 24: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth My Word and believeth on Him that sent Me hath everlasting life." And John 8, 51: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, If a man keep My saying, he shall never see death." Yes, John 6, 63 He declares: "The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life." And John 12, 50: The Word of My Father "is life everlasting. Whatsoever I speak therefore, even as the Father said unto Me, so I speak." [*Note.* — *Ἡ ἐντολὴ τοῦ πατρὸς ζωὴ αἰώνιός ἐστιν* does not mean: "He that keepeth the Law of the Father hath life everlasting," but according to

John 17, 8: The words which My Father commanded Me to speak are the life everlasting.] If, therefore, the words of the Gospel are called the words of life, John 6, 68; Phil. 2, 16, then this means nothing else than that they contain and bring eternal life.

But how is this? Is not Christ *Himself* the Life? Did He not say to Thomas: "I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life," John 14, 6, and to Martha: "I am the Resurrection and the Life," John 11, 25? Accordingly He linked the true life with faith in Himself. John 6, 40 He says: "This is the will of Him that sent Me that every one which seeth the Son and believeth on Him may have everlasting life," and John 11, 26: "Whosoever liveth and believeth in Me shall never die."

True; and yet this is no contradiction; for the Son is in the Word. It is for this very reason that God's Word brings forgiveness of sins and life because it brings Christ. The vessel quenches the thirst because it is filled with water. And therefore all the dear fathers also drank deeply from it. And such in-one-another is not only possible, but within the limits of the kingdom of God also perfectly natural. Human promises are, of course, either lies or at best only shadows of things. But God *gives* when He speaks. "For He spake, and it was done; He commanded, and it stood fast." Ps. 33, 9. Men may indeed come and wish peace; that will not do much good; but when Christ steps into the midst of His trembling disciples with His salutation of peace, then their hearts, because of His words, become calm like the waves of the Galilean Sea. He giveth not as the world giveth. John 14, 27. If He, therefore, says to you in His Word: "He that believeth becomes righteous," and you believe, then you are righteous; for His Word is both almighty and true. Because it is the Word of the living God, therefore this Word, as upon wings, carries Christ's bloody merits into hut and palace. To speak with Luther: It is like unto a sled or conduit through which and on which Christ is brought to us. (St. Louis Ed., VI, 634.)

Also the words of Paul? Also those of Paul, yes, of all apostles. For between these words a chain is fastened which never breaks. Here the corner-stone is Christ: His words are life. John 6, 63; 8, 52. Thence the chain goes upward to the Father: Christ's words are the words of the heavenly Father. John 17, 8; 12, 50. And downward: the words of the apostles are the words of Christ, Luke 10, 16; 1 Pet. 1, 25; 1 Thess. 1, 8, yes, the words of God, Acts 4, 27. 29; Matt. 10, 20; 1 Cor. 2, 13. Therefore Paul writes

to the Thessalonians: "For this cause also thank we God without ceasing, because, when ye received the Word of God which ye heard of us, ye received it not as the word of men, but, as it is in truth, the Word of God." 1 Thess. 2, 13. In the first chapter of the Epistle to the Galatians he even threatens himself with the curse if he should ever dare to alter anything in the Word of God which he had preached. Gal. 1, 9. 10. So it is God's Gospel whether it comes from the mouth of Christ or that of His apostles, and it truly brings with it forgiveness of sins, life, and salvation. [*Note.* — We say "Gospel"; for the Law, though it is also the Word of God, does not bring forgiveness.] Where can it be found? In Holy Scriptures, in the preaching [of the Gospel], and in the words of absolution. Here as well as there: under the pulpit, in the closet, and at the altar it makes righteous those who believe it. "Thus you see that the whole Church is full of forgiveness of sins." (Luther. St. Louis Ed., X, 634.)

But just as the Word of God is the means of grace, it is also the means of judgment. "He that rejecteth Me," says Christ, John 12, 48, "and receiveth not My words, hath one that judgeth him: the Word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the Last Day." God deals with us only through His Word; even man deals with man in no other way.

It is a peculiar objection that this doctrine, which is the doctrine of Holy Scriptures, separates God from the world and gives the Word an independent position beside Him. It is the omnipresent God that speaks through the Word; how, then, can one speak of separation? Or by what right dare my efficacious word be called a power independent of myself? God's Word stands *beside* Him, that is true. For the Apostle Paul, at his departure, commended the elders of Ephesus "to God *and* the Word of His grace." Acts 20, 32. It is, however, never independent of Him. But God Himself gives it at all times and in all places where there are people who receive it. John 17, 8. You ask, Why does God not communicate Himself without the Word? He does not wish to give His divinity uncovered, else we should have to die; for God has said: "There shall no man see Me and live." Ex. 33, 20. That ends the matter. Therefore God must conceal Himself, so that we can grasp and take Him. He could indeed have chosen some other means to cover Himself. But just as a physician endeavors to administer his remedies to the patient in a fluid to which he is accustomed, so God uses a means which is familiar to man, the voice of speech, to give him the merits of Christ.

Thus it is evident that we receive forgiveness in the Word. Whoever does not lay hold of it there may open his mouth as wide as he pleases, he will nevertheless not receive it, just as little as a wanderer will cross a stream if he does not use the bridge spanning it. Therefore we praise God from our whole heart for having given us His Word, in which we can lay hold of His forgiveness. How could we otherwise "make a firm stand against the accusations of the divine Law, the great might of the devil, the terror of death, and, finally, against despair and the anguish of hell, if [we] would not grasp the divine promises, the Gospel, as a tree or branch in the great flood, in the strong, violent stream, amidst the waves and billows of the anguish of death"? (Apology. *Triglotta,* 213.)

Ancient and modern fanatics, however, are little pleased with this. They claim that every one must at least once in his life hear the voice from heaven: "Son, be of good cheer; thy sins be forgiven thee!" This, they claim, is justification. Luther complains: "They do not direct us into the outward Gospel, but into dreamland and say: 'Stand in idleness, as I did, and you, too, will experience it. The heavenly voice will come, and God Himself will speak to you.' . . . Do you see the devil, the enemy of divine order? How he . . . makes your mouth gape and meanwhile breaks down the path and way, the ladder, and everything by which the Spirit is to come to you, namely, the external ordinances of God in bodily Baptism, token, and oral Word, and wants to teach you, not how the Spirit must come to you, but how you must come to the Spirit, that you must learn to sail on the clouds and ride on the wind; and they do not say how or when, where or what, but that you will experience it as they did." (St. Louis Ed., XX, 203.) In fact, God will not act with His Spirit in concealment, as it were, and in secret nor do something in particular for each one individually; otherwise no one could know where to meet and find Him. No; He has ordered matters so that forgiveness of sins is to be outwardly with the Word and Sacrament, so that we may know that what is being done there is truly being done by God. "Say not in thine heart, Who shall ascend into heaven? that is to bring Christ down [anew] from above" (who came down long ago), "or, Who shall descend into the deep? that is to bring up Christ [anew] from the dead" (who has risen long ago). (Rather,) "the Word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth and in thy heart; that is, the Word of faith, which we preach." On this wise speaketh

the righteousness which is of faith, according to Rom. 10, 6—8. And in order that no one may be in the dark as to how the apostle means this, he proceeds to say that justification comes to pass in this way, that you lay hold of the Gospel which is preached with your heart and confess it. "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised Him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." Rom. 10, 9. 10. Where is there one syllable in this text concerning an immediate communication from God, concerning a heavenly voice or the like? It is rather the Word which brings forgiveness, that Word which the apostles preached. There, in this Word, you are to lay hold of forgiveness. If you do not lay hold of it there, you will in vain stand gaping up to heaven for it. Luther says: Verily, "enthusiasm inheres in Adam and his children from the beginning to the end of the world, having been implanted and infused into them by the old dragon, and is the origin, power, and strength of all heresy. . . . Therefore we ought and must constantly maintain this point, that God does not wish to deal with us otherwise than through the spoken Word and the Sacrament. It is the devil himself whatsoever is extolled as Spirit without the Word and Sacraments." (Smalcald Art. *Triglotta,* 497.) In this manner the Anabaptists fell into perdition, and to-day still many a one loses his faith in this way. First he hears a voice: "Thy sins be forgiven thee," which is true, but not on account of the voice, but on account of the Word of God. Then he hears another voice: "An office or great wealth will come to thee," which, however, does not come true. So his faith in the forgiveness is made to waver; for he concludes: "If the voice lied once, it lied twice." Therefore you should let voices remain voices and seek Christ in the Word; for there He is to be found. Not as though we denied the sweet comfort of the Holy Spirit in the heart; we rather rejoice in it. We say only this: The Comforter whom Christ sends, "speaks not of Himself; but whatsoever He has heard, that He speaks. . . . For He shall receive of Mine," says Christ, "and shall show it unto you." John 16, 14. 15. In this way He quickens God's Word in our hearts; and that is what the apostle means when he says of the justifying Word that it is in our mouths and in our hearts. Rom. 10, 8. For God's Word remains God's Word whether it comes to us through the memory or through the eye or through the ear. And it is never separated

from God, as the word of Plato is separated from Plato; but it is always truly spoken by the living, omnipresent God. Therefore the people must be taught not to meditate upon voices which they have or have not heard, but to lay hold of the forgiveness which is present in the Word which they are hearing; there is justification and assurance and everything. (Smalcald Art. *Triglotta,* 495.)

Moreover, the Word of God has in a special way assumed form, as it were, in the holy Sacraments. For the great fact that Holy Baptism and the Lord's Supper bring forgiveness of sins is caused by the Word. (Luther. St. Louis Ed., XX, 275. 276; XIX, 1261; XVI, 1935.) Whether you take hold of the bare Word or the Word in the Sacrament, you always grasp Christ; for Gospel is Gospel, and faith is faith. Thus the Holy Supper brings forgiveness of sins by virtue of the Word; for "the words which stand here, namely: 'Given and shed for you for the remission of sins,' do it. Which words are, beside the bodily eating and drinking, as the chief thing in the Sacrament; and he that believes these words has what they say and express, namely, the forgiveness of sins." (Small Catechism. *Triglotta,* 557.) Christ, however, does not come by blood only, but by water and blood. 1 John 5, 6. Therefore the Scriptures testify of Holy Baptism that it saves: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." Mark 16, 16. As in other texts, *justification* and damnation are placed in opposition to each other, so here salvation and damnation, which is an indisputable testimony for the fact that with salvation we receive justification and with justification, salvation. Thus St. Paul writes to Titus (chap. 3, 5): God, "according to His mercy, saved us by the washing of regeneration," and Peter: The water "saves us in Baptism," 1 Pet. 3, 21. For this the word "cleanse" is substituted in Eph. 5, 26; and Acts 22, 16 we read that Baptism washes away sins, and Acts 2, 38, that Holy Baptism is received for the remission of sins; yes, Gal. 3, 27 it is taught that in Baptism we put on the Lord Jesus, that is, that in Baptism we are clothed with His all-sufficient merits as with a garment, in order that our nakedness might not be seen. But Scripture comprehends the full glory of Holy Baptism in this one statement — new birth. "Verily, verily, I say unto thee," says the Lord to Nicodemus, "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." John 3, 3. Nicodemus does not understand this. Then the Lord explains what He means: "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born

of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." John 3, 5. Where else than in Baptism does a birth "of water" take place? The remark of Calvin that water means Spirit and that "of water and of the Spirit" means "of Spirit and Spirit" is evidently rather an evasion than explanation. [*Note. — Aquam ergo et Spiritum simpliciter accipio pro Spiritu, qui aqua est. — Calvin.*] But if it is said: First water and after twenty years Spirit, then it should be noticed, first, that the text does not say this; and secondly, this conception evidently conflicts with the picture which the Lord Jesus uses. Verily, if regeneration were a development which lasted for a period of two decades, the Lord could not have chosen a more unfortunate picture to illustrate it than that of birth, which takes place in a moment. But in order to leave no doubt that Baptism is in truth the birth of water and of the Spirit on which salvation depends, He, shortly before His departure, said plainly and without figure: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Mark 16, 16. Now I ask every one who is still able to see with his own eyes: To-day God says: "He that is born of water and of the Spirit shall be saved"; to-morrow He says: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved": now, is Baptism, apprehended by faith, the birth of water and of the Spirit, or is it not? If it is not, I am certainly anxious to know where the water will be found which is meant John 3, 5. The dear apostles at least knew none other than the baptismal water. Therefore they said of the baptismal water that it saves, 1 Pet. 3, 21, of the baptismal water that it cleanses, Eph. 5, 26, of the baptismal water that it washes away sins, Acts 22, 16, and that it brings the merits of Christ, Gal. 3, 27. Yes, St. Paul says, Titus 3, 5: God has "saved us by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost." And here even Calvin does not dare to deny that the apostle is thinking of Holy Baptism. [*Note.— Per lavacrum regenerationis. Non dubito quin saltem ad baptismum alludat. Imo facile patiar de baptismo locum exponi,* etc. — *Calvin.*] But "how can water do such great things? It is not the water indeed that does them, but the word of God which is in and with the water, and faith which trusts such word of God in the water. For without the word of God the water is simple water only and no Baptism. But with the word of God it is a Baptism, that is, a gracious water of life and a washing of regeneration in the Holy Ghost." (Small Catechism. *Triglotta,* 551.) For when Scripture maintains these five propositions side by side: God saves,

2 Tim. 1, 9; 1 Tim. 2, 4; Jas. 4, 12; the merit of Christ saves, Rom. 5, 9; John 3, 17; 12, 47; Acts 4, 12; 15, 11; the Word of God saves, 1 Cor. 15, 2; Acts 11, 14; 1 Cor. 1, 21; Baptism saves, 1 Pet. 3, 21; faith saves, Luke 7, 50; Rom. 10, 9; Eph. 2, 8, — then these are either just so many contradictions, or God is the Physician, the blood of Christ the medicinal herb, the Word of God the fluid which contains it, and our faith the drinking thereof. And Baptism? It is the invigorating bath which the Physician prescribes first for every one who places himself under His care.

So also the Fathers teach. "On this account let no one boast of his works," says the Apology, "because no one is justified by his deeds. But he who is righteous has it given him because he was justified in the laver [Baptism]." (*Triglotta,* 151.) And the Small Catechism answers the question: "What does Baptism give or profit?" as follows: "It works forgiveness of sins, delivers from death and the devil, and gives eternal salvation to all who believe this." (*Triglotta,* 551.) The Saxon Visitation Articles of 1592 teach with the same clearness: "There is but *one* Baptism and *one* washing [ablution]; not such as is wont to remove the filth of the body, but [such as] washes us from sins." And: "Through Baptism . . . God saves us and works in us such righteousness and cleansing from sins that he who perseveres in this covenant and confidence unto the end is not lost, but has eternal life." And: "Baptism is the washing of regeneration for the reason that in it we are born anew and sealed by grace." (*Triglotta,* 1153.) The Articles of Visitation reject, on the other hand, as erroneous and false the doctrine "that Baptism is an outward washing of water whereby an inner washing [ablution] from sins is *only signified.*" Again: "That Baptism neither works nor confers regeneration, faith, the grace of God, and salvation, but only signifies and seals it." Finally: "That regeneration occurs not in and at [with] Baptism, but not till afterwards in adult years, and in some [many] not until old age." (*Triglotta,* 1155. 1157.) Aegidius Hunnius fights the same doctrine also in his private writings and declares that God in Baptism grants us two benefits: the reception into the relationship of children and new emotions in the heart, stating that the first is nothing else than justification. Gerhard teaches just as clearly: "Baptism is the efficacious means of the remission of sins" (*Baptismus est efficax medium remissionis peccatorum*); yes, God has instituted it for the very purpose of justifying us. And so they all teach. (*To be continued.*)

# The Historical Significance of the Formula of Concord.

Prof. R. W. Heintze, St. Louis, Mo.

*(Continued.)*

To know and to appreciate the reconciliation of God to man means to know and to appreciate the person and the work of Jesus Christ, the God-man. Luther was filled with that conviction, and so the study of the person and of the work of our Savior was of the utmost importance to him. His Christology was definite and in every phase based upon his Bible study. He recognized the value of the ubiquity and the communication of attributes also for the defense of the Biblical teaching on the Lord's Supper. However, his faith about this Supper was not deduced from Christology, but was based directly on the Biblical relation of its institution.[1] The real presence, the communion of Christ's body and blood with the elements, the oral eating and drinking of Christ's body and blood by all communicants: all these things were essential to him and were predicated by direct words of God.

Zwingli emptied the Supper of its sacramental character and reduced it to a memorial ceremony. But Calvin, in the southwestern part of Switzerland, had initiated a middle-of-the-road movement. Since his stay at Strassburg, after the Wittenberg Concordia, he took a vivid interest in the union of the two churches. His *De Coena Domini,* 1540, small, but significant, evidently approached the Lutheran view in the matter itself, while its method of argumentation rather follows that of Zwingli (*panis non modo repraesentat, sed etiam offert; . . . signa veritati et substantiae suae coniuncta*). This little book traveled through many districts, also in Germany, and made silent propaganda. In Switzerland Calvin succeeded, in the *Consensus Tigurinus* of 1549, to modify the Zwinglians' position very much. The *Consensus* contained the phraseology of the Augustana of 1540, the Variata. In Strassburg and especially in Wittenberg, Calvin's hopes for unification were shared.

---

1) Paul Tschackert, in his *Entstehung der luth. u. d. ref. Kirchenlehre,* 1910, p. 177, makes the loose statement: *"Zu ihrer Begruendung nahm Luther jetzt konsequenterweise die Christologie zu Hilfe; die Ubiquitaetslehre erhielt die Stellung eines theoretischen Hilfssatzes fuer die Abendmahlstheorie."* If *"Begruendung"* includes the refutation of objections, the sentence may stand; if, however, *"Begruendung"* means the reason for the positive statement, the sentence is not true.

Melanchthon had vacillated almost from the beginning. In 1529 he said: "Only with the greatest reluctance (*maximo certamine*) I have been brought to the thesis: *corpus Domini vere praesens in coena esse.*" [2] At Marburg he had agreed with Luther in the real presence, but not in the *oralis manducatio.*[3] In 1537 he wrote that "for a decade" he had been "brooding day and night on this matter." [4] Since 1538 he gave up using the words of institution (ἐστί) as basis and turned to 1 Cor. 10. To him the mystery of the Supper was the substance contact of the God-man with the soul of man, which contact is more than a mere effect of the Spirit because it is effected through the communication of the Lord's body and thus is a supersensual contact of man's soul with the transfigured and yet corporeal Savior. That agrees with Calvin's *"Dico igitur in coenae mysterio per symbola panis et vini Christi vere nobis exhiberi, quo scilicet primum in unum corpus cum ipso coalescamus, deinde, participes facti substantiae eius, in bonorum omnium communicatione virtutem quoque sentiamus."* [5] And, according to Dr. Peucer's, Melanchthon's son-in-law's, narrative, the *Magister Germaniae* gave as his last definition: *"In distributione panis et vini testatur Filius Dei se vere praesentem esse et distribuere credentibus suis suum corpus et sanguinem,* ID EST [emphasis mine], *universa beneficia sua, quae fide necesse est accipi."* [6] Was Melanchthon influenced merely by his desire not to hurt the admired, scholarly Calvin? Or did Calvin's content of the Supper, still possessing "mystery," but relieving such as accepted his view of the necessity of insisting on a literal ἐστί, "appeal more" to his individual make-up?

Melanchthon did not lecture on theology only; he was a much-sought professor of the *humaniora.* And the party of Philippists had a large number of graduates of Wittenberg who had studied history, medicine, and philology there, but were religiously attracted more by Calvinism on account of its "rational, logical compactness." Loescher writes: *"Man sahe haufenweise Politicos, Medicos, Poeten und Philologos, welche doch die Sache theologisch zu untersuchen weder Lust noch Vermoegen* [ability] *hatten, gleichwohl aus ganzem Herzen zu dem Calvinismo incli-*

2) *C. R.*, I, 1106.

3) Minutes of the disputation, in Bullinger, *Ref.-Gesch.*, II, 275 sq.

4) *C. R.*, III, 537.

5) *Instit.*, IV, 17. 11; likewise: Fasti, IV, 17, 32.

6) *C. R.*, IX, 1089. Whether Peucer is an authentic witness is discussed by Herrlinger, *Die Theologie Mel.*, 1879, p. 152 f.

*nieren. Peucer war der vornehmste von dieser Cabale.*" [7] And Hubert Languet, a decided Calvinist, wrote to Calvin: "There is a healthy growth of those at this school who favor the truth [Calvinism]." [8] Also among the clergy, ministers and professors, there were large numbers who spun out Melanchthonian teaching in the direction toward Calvinism or continued Melanchthon's spinning. The Electorate Saxony was filled with them; but they partly used veiled, ambiguous phrases, partly were not recognized on account of the sleepy trust of Elector August [9] and others. Hidden Calvinism, Crypto-Calvinism, was *the* tragedy of the third quarter of the century.

Before we view this tragedy, we shall have to try to get a view of the general situation in regard to the Lord's Supper. In the southwest of Germany, Calvin traveled along an easy road, prepared by Butzer. In England John Laski published the *Consensus Tigurinus* in 1552, under Edward VI. Originally a Roman Catholic clergyman, he had become a Protestant in East Frisia, where he introduced a sort of presbyterian constitution. The Augsburg Interim drove him, together with a number of Frisians, to England, where he became a full-fledged Calvinist. The government of Bloody Mary expelled him, and having been refused an asylum in Denmark, he hoped to find refuge in Hamburg or Bremen. The Lutheran pastor Westphal (Hamburg), a shrewd observer of events and movements, had opened polemics against the Swiss, calling attention to the variety of opinions and conceptions on their side.[10] It was meant as a warning to his fellow-Lutherans, clearly showing up the internal differences between Calvinism and Lutheranism.[11] This book was followed by another, in the succeeding year, which contained the New Testament arguments for the Lord's Supper and called upon all true disciples of Luther to defend the doctrine against the onrushing Reformed errors. In this year Laski had at last found refuge in Frankfort on the Main, while another Cal-

---

7) *Hist. Motuum*, II, 183.

8) *Epistolae*, IX, 486.

9) Caspar Peucer was professor of medicine, but also court physician to the Elector August. The value of the position for keeping the elector in the dark is easily seen.

10) *Farrago Confusarum et inter se Dissidentium Opinionum de Coena Sacra.* Magdeburg, 1552, 5 vols.

11) He winds up with: "The blasphemies of the Sacramentarians should rather be refuted by the civic powers (*sceptro magistratus*) than with the pen."

vinistic refugee, Micronius, owing to the influence of Westphal, was refused a refuge at Hamburg. Because of such treatment of his fellow-churchmen Calvin felt impelled to write against Westphal his *Defensio Sanae et Orthodoxae Doctrinae de Sacramentis,* etc.[12] This work contained hot, biting invectives and evidenced a most insulting contempt for the theological abilities of the opponents. In very short order a double formidable phalanx was arrayed against him, and publishers reaped a harvest. Several of the publications were rather fat tomes (Timann's *Farrago Sententiarum in Vera . . . Doctrina de Coena Domini,* 1555, has 605 pages). Calvin's *Secunda Defensio,* etc, 1556,[13] attempted to draw the Saxon Philippists openly to his side. Westphal distributed questionnaires among the "spirited magistrates" of many cities and among many theologians of Lower Saxony and received satisfactory replies from Magdeburg, Mansfeld, Bremen, Hildesheim, Hamburg, Luebeck, Brunswick, Hanover, and many other cities, some of which wrote very extensive declarations of the Lutheran doctrine on the Sacrament. These he collected and published. When, in Frankfort, the accusers of Laski were requested to prove that he differed from the Augustana, Westphal advised the Frankfort magistrate most vehemently to expel Laski. At last Calvin ceased his efforts, having in vain tried to induce Melanchthon to give him a clean bill on the Augustana. The bitterness with which the controversy was carried on on both sides did much to incense the German Lutherans against the Calvinists all the more, for they held their attitude responsible for the whole affair.

At Bremen, too, waves rose high. Timann requested each one of the Bremen clergymen to subscribe to his *Farrago's* 605 pages, which Dr. Hardenberg declined to do, thus bringing about his exile. (He died as a Reformed minister.) Yet, through the mayor's influence gradually all Bremen was made Calvinistic.

In the Palatinate tenacious Hesshusius was expelled because he worked against all Calvinists in his territory. Of course, in the Palatinate, the native country of Melanchthon, there were many adherents of Magister Philip. Elector Frederick III, wishing to form his own judgment, read much of the literature written during the controversy. Unfortunately he sought explanations from Thomas Erast, a medical scholar, who at heart was a Calvinist. Erast's information and book *Gruendlicher Bericht* succeeded in

12) *C. R.*, op. Calv., XXXVII, 1 sqq.
13) *C. R.*, Calvin., XXXVII, 41 sqq.

persuading Frederick completely to accept the Reformed views. Heidelberg University already had several Philippists and Calvinists. To them Frederick added two decided friends of Calvinism, Olevianus and Ursinus, of Zurich, and the Italian Tremellius. The cult was ruthlessly changed. From that time on the churches no longer had pictures, baptismal fonts, altars, and organs; biscuits (*Semmeln*) replaced wafers; many festivals were stricken off the calendar. Such pastors as would not submit to the new order of things were deposed and replaced by Reformed clergymen, mostly from the Netherlands.

The Elector had Olevianus and Ursinus formulate a catechism. At Heidelberg it was submitted to the inspectors and the clergy, was translated into Latin, and, in 1563, published in Latin and German. —

We are now ready to return to Saxony. Here the *Corpus Doctrinae Philippicum* (also *Misnicum,* Meissen) had been introduced into the churches. Elector August had witnessed all those Hamburg, Bremen, Frankfort, Wurttemberg, Palatinate discussions and events. He wanted to be, and to be looked upon as, a genuine Lutheran, and he thought that in his realm, both in cities and villages, the clergy continued to preach and teach, that everybody believed and lived, along truly Biblical lines, and that "his" university, his Wittenberg, where the Reformation had been born, still was the faithful nursery of the true doctrine. When, therefore, the theologians of Jena in the Duchy, at Altenburg, joining in a conference with those of the Electorate, charged the Wittenberg men with adulterating the pure doctrine, he was incensed. He was going to make sure about that; but when his clergymen expressly reiterated their adherence to the *Corpus Doctrinae Philippicum,* he was satisfied.

In 1571 the Wittenberg theological faculty issued a new catechism. This catechism decidedly rejected ubiquity and taught a Christology and a doctrine of the Lord's Supper in harmony with Calvin's teachings.[14] The title is: *Catechesis Continens Explicationem Simplicem et Brevem Decalogi, Symboli Apost., Orationis Dominicae,* etc. It was published anonymously, though the faculty had signed the preface. This preface declares that Luther's Enchiridion is meant for young children and that those who have progressed in doctrine need more explicit and detailed instruction, reinforced by more proofs.

---

14) pp. 77. 123.

Jena at once criticized the catechism; Wittenberg defended it in the *Grundfeste,* the full title of which was: *Von der Person und Menschwerdung unsers Herrn Jesu Christi, der wahren christlichen Kirche Grundfeste wider die neuen Marcioniten, Samosatener, Sabellianer, Arianer, Nestorianer, Eutychianer und Monotheleten unter dem flacianischen Haufen, durch die Theologen zu Wittenberg, 1571.* There is a peculiar shifting of points in its discussion: it pretends that its *raison d'être* is not so much the necessity of declarations on the Holy Supper as the necessity of rejecting Brenz's and Chemnitz's Christology, particularly the *ubiquitas* "theory." The book clearly shows their agreement with Calvin, but the authors claim that they agree with the old Church, which, in this matter, Calvin happens to do also.

Elector August was deeply imbued with a sense of personal responsibility; a most sincere purpose moved him to uphold the genuine Lutheran Church and doctrine. Twice at Torgau he had instituted conferences of civic officials, noblemen, town representatives, and professors of Wittenberg and Leipzig for the discussion of religious and ecclesiastic matters. They had met for months, but parted without definite decisions. Now again he had several prominent leaders formulate a definite declaration on the Lord's Supper, at Dresden, 1571, the *Consensus Dresdensis.* This document follows the lines of the Wittenberg catechism; and the paragraph on the Holy Supper states that Christ's real body has been sacrificed on the cross and is given us with bread in the Sacrament, the Lord thereby testifying that He adopts us, makes us members of His body, cleanses us with His blood, grants us forgiveness of sins, and wishes truly to live and be efficacious in us.[15] The elector hoped that all Lutherans would subscribe to this *Consensus.* But the assent did not come; on the contrary, from many sides there came protests, a collection of which was published at Jena in 1572. The elector had implicit confidence in Wittenberg and Leipzig; so Jena must be wrong, and its refusal to sign the *Consensus Dresdensis* must be sinful. Two years later he became administrator of the Saxon Duchy in which Jena was situated. When, upon his renewed request that the clergy sign the *Consensus,* they again refused to do so, he expelled them, so that Philippian Calvinism threatened to spread from the Electorate to the Duchy.[16] The Jesuits rejoiced, and the Palatinate

15) Gieseler, *Kirchengesch.*, III, 2, pp. 264—267.

16) At Weimar four superintendents and ten pastors were removed, and Philippists put in their places. Grulich, *Denkwuerdigkeiten von Torgau,* 1855, p. 91.

offered thanksgivings because Saxony had gone over to the Reformed Church. But August was the Thomas unwilling to believe.

Suddenly one day in 1574 light dawned upon the elector. The appearance of the anonymous [17] *Exegesis Perspicua . . . de Sacra Coena* indicated that the Crypto-Calvinists believed the time ripe for coming out into the open. The *Exegesis* expressly rejected sacramental union, manducation with the mouth, manducation by unbelievers, things which formerly had been passed over in silence. Praise of the Calvinists and depreciation of Luther were followed by the advice to agree on the formula: "Bread is the communion of the body" and to stop thinking about ubiquity and the use of the Holy Supper. Of course, this was Melanchthonism, but as congruous to Calvinism as one triangle to another according to any geometrical theorem.

August was dumbfounded when at last he saw how he had been deceived — dumbfounded and indignant. Dr. Peucer and three other leaders were arrested and brought before a heresy court, which had been arranged for in the Second Torgau Article, 1571. Besides, the legislature was called together at Torgau, which subpenaed theological professors of Wittenberg and Leipzig. The town's dwellings were filled with scholars, so that two had to lodge in one room.[18] A confession on the Lord's Supper, German and Latin, had been worked out by a commission and was presented to all present, even to the Fellows [19] of both universities, for signature. This confession [20] is still unsatisfactory, but its articles on the Supper "contain all elements of Lutheran theology" and reject *nominatim* Calvin, Beza, Bullinger, and the Heidelberg theologians.

Several members of the cabal remained obdurate and were deposed and exiled, others imprisoned. The catastrophe of the tragedy shows a sort of reinstatement of the genuinely Lutheran Church and Chemnitz, Andreae, and Selnecker as the right hands of the Elector.

Luther was dead, Melanchthon was dead, Calvin was dead. A circumspect plan had been on the way to plant a Calvinistic

---

17) On the probability of authorship see Tschackert, p. 547. The book was not on the market, but was distributed privately.

18) Grulich, p. 91, note.

19) Grulich, p. 92.

20) *Kurz Bekenntnis u. Artikel v. h. Abendmahl, . . . uebergeben und gehandelt im juengsten Landtag zu Torgau.* Tschackert gives a short summary, p. 548.

Church in Germany. This Church was determined to prevent a lucid, definite, complete declaration on Christology and the Sacrament. When the Formula of Concord was being prepared, Calvinists and Crypto-Calvinists, and even Queen Elizabeth from across the Channel shouted: "Don't! — or we shall and will withdraw from the Augsburg Confession." These people avowed their desire for unity; but "the nearer Philippists came to Calvinism, the less unity was to be thought of" (Schmauck). Calvinism is closer to natural man than the Book of Concord. Union between the two strengthens natural man. This attempted union in our period was about to perpetuate internal, ecclesiastical strife. For even the *Kurz Bekenntnis* could never be the last word. Genuine and consistent Lutheran faith has great inner strength. Union with Calvin does not allow the full evangelical faith to exert itself. The Tory *Realpolitik* of Calvinism had begun to exert its tendency to overshadow the status of the Church of the Reformation, in which freedom is gained by yielding, loving adherence to the Word of God. *(To be concluded.)*

## The Horrors of Voltaire's Last Days.

Prof. John Theodore Mueller, St. Louis, Mo.

*(Concluded.)*

The June number of the Theological Monthly brought the account of Voltaire's death as given by Father Kreiten in his fine work *Voltaire, ein Charakterbild.*[1]) We have quoted his report mainly to show how carefully and painstakingly Father Kreiten deals with probabilities and facts and how conscientiously he weighs the evidence. Urged by his readers, the author, in addition, produces the evidence for his claims in a special appendix and furnishes substantial proof by the eye-witnesses: the Abbé Gaultier, whose report is corroborated by the Abbé of St. Sulpice; the attending physician Dr. Tronchin; Belle-et-Bonne, the Marquise de Villette; the servants of the Hotel of the Marquis de Villette, where Voltaire died. Let us now examine these reports.

1. The official report of the *Abbé Gaultier* to the Archbishop of Paris, with some letters by Voltaire and his "friends," appeared in P. Elie Harel's *Recueil des Particularités Curieuses de la Vie et de la Morte de Voltaire* (Paris, 1780). The report is very

1) Zweite, vermehrte Auflage. Freiburg im Breisgau. Herdersche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1885. Also: B. Herder Company, St. Louis, Mo.

conservative, dealing only with the main facts, and was evidently composed with much consideration for the relatives of Voltaire, especially his nephew, the priest Mignot. Father Kreiten says of him: "He does not tell the whole truth, perhaps because the pious priest would not see or believe it, or because that which he said was sufficient." Also, we must recall that Abbé Gaultier had withdrawn and did not witness the last frenzy of Voltaire; in his report he states that the last hours of Voltaire, as far as he witnessed them, were full of horror and despair. When on October 12, 1778, the well-known academician De la Lande asked Gaultier whether his official memorandum, for which authenticity was claimed, was really authentic, and especially the letters that accompanied it, he confirmed this and invited De la Lande to compare the original letters in his possession. The academician accepted the invitation and was convinced of the absolute truth of the memorandum. (Harel, German edition, p. 170f.)

2. The main evidence coming from *Dr. Tronchin* is a letter written by him to his friend in Geneva, Carl Bonnet, on June 20, 1778.[2] This letter is preserved at Geneva and has been frequently published. (Cp. Kreiten, p. 556.) Dr. Tronchin was an eminent physician and one of the most famous surgeons of his time. He was born at Geneva, in 1709, and died in 1781. He studied in Holland under the celebrated Boerhave. In 1756 he was called to Paris to inoculate the children of the Duke of Orleans, which was justly considered a most perilous undertaking, especially since the king had expressed his personal displeasure at the experiment. However, he had introduced the practise with great success in Holland and Switzerland and so ventured on the risk without fear. The children recovered; he was highly rewarded and honored and rose to the highest dignities of his profession.[3] Dr. Tronchin lived at Geneva when Voltaire moved to the near-by Ferney; and though he was an ardent Calvinist, not at all in sympathy with the corruption which ensued after Voltaire and his libertine friends exerted their baneful influence over the city, he consented to be the attending physician of the aged "patriarch." His wise counsels and his honest reproofs of the philosopher's profligate life did much to lengthen Voltaire's life. However, a quarrel soon occurred (the *guerre de Genève*), and dis-

2) Remember that Voltaire died May 30, 1778. — *M.*

3) The *Christian Observer*, Vol. 58, p. 672; also Kreiten's *Voltaire*, Appendix, p. 565.

gusted with the pollution at Ferney and the corruption at Geneva, Dr. Tronchin moved to Paris. The character of Dr. Tronchin is beyond reproach. Both as man and as physician he ranked among the leading men of his age. Truthful, honest, firm in his convictions, and without fear, his letter to Carl Bonnet carries a tremendous weight.

The letter of Dr. Tronchin is quoted in full in the *Christian Observer* (Vol. 58, p. 673) and in part, fortunately in the original, in Father Kreiten's book. We quote from the *Christian Observer*, adding the most important words of the French original. The letter reads: —

"He had imagined that I would not see him, and this thought tormented him. In haste he wrote me a letter, perfumed with incense, in which he swears eternal esteem and regard for me. I visited him. 'You have been,' said he to me, 'my savior; be here my tutelar angel. I have but one breath of life left; I come to yield it up in your arms.' He probably spoke the truth — they will kill him.[4])

"If my principles, my dear friend, had required to be strengthened by any tie, the man whom I have seen become weak, agonize, and die before my eyes would have secured them by a Gordian knot; and on comparing the death of a good man, which is but the end of a fine day, with that of Voltaire, I should have seen the difference which exists between a fine day and a tempest; between the serenity of the soul of a wise man who ceases to live, and the dreadful torment of him to whom death is the king of terrors.[5])

"I thank God that I did not need this spectacle, and yet *forte olim meminisse juvabit.* This man was then predestined to die in my hands. *I always told him the truth,* and unhappily for him, *I am the only person who never deceived him.* 'Yes, my friend,' he often said to me, 'you alone gave me good advice; if I had followed it, I should not be in the dreadful state in which I am;

---

4) That is, Voltaire's "friends," who did not have the courage to prevent Voltaire's excessive use of stimulants, his "follies," and his overwork.

5) "*Si mes principes avaient eu besoin que j'en serrasse le noeud, l'homme que j'ai vu dépérir, agoniser, et mourir sous mes yeux, en aurait fait un noeud Gordien; et en comparant la mort d'un homme de bien, qui n'est que la fin d'un beau jour, à celle de Voltaire, j'aurais vu bien sensiblement la différence qu'il y a entre un beau jour et une tempête, entre la sérénité de l'âme d'un sage qui cesse de vivre et le* TOURMENT AFFREUX *de celui pour qui la mort est le roi des épouvantements. . . . Cet homme, donc, était prédestiné à mourir dans mes mains.*" (W. Kreiten, *Voltaire*, p. 566.)

I should have returned to Ferney. I should not have become intoxicated with the incense which turned my head. Yes, I have swallowed nothing but smoke; you can do me no more good. Send me the physician for madmen. What fatality brought me to Paris? You told me when I arrived that an oak of eighty years does not bear transplanting; and you spoke the truth. Why did I not believe you? And when I had given you my word that I would set out in the invalid carriage which you had promised me, why did I not go? Pity me; I am mad.

"He was to set out two days after the follies of his coronation at the theater; but the next morning he received a deputation from the French Academy which entreated him to honor it with his presence before his departure. He attended in the afternoon and was made president of the society by acclamation. He accepted the office, which is for three months. He thus chained himself for three months, and of his promise given to me nothing remained. From this moment to his death his days were only a gust of madness. He was ashamed of it. When he saw me, he asked my pardon; he pressed my hands; he entreated me to have pity on him and not to abandon him, especially as he must use new efforts to make a suitable return for the honor which the Academy had done him and to induce it to labor at a new dictionary like the *della Crusca*. The compilation of this dictionary was his last dominant idea, his last passion. He had undertaken the letter *A* and had distributed the twenty-three other letters to twenty-three academicians, many of whom greatly irritated him by undertaking the task with an ill grace. 'They are idle fellows,' he said, 'accustomed to stagnate in idleness; but I will make them advance.' And it was to make them advance that, in the interval of the two sittings, he took, at his peril, so many drugs and committed so many follies, which hastened his death, and which threw him into a state of despair and dreadful madness. *I cannot recollect it without horror.*[6] As soon as he saw that all that he had done to increase his strength had produced a contrary effect, death was ever before his eyes. From that moment rage took possession of his soul. Imagine to yourself the madness of Orestes. *Furiis agitatus obiit.*"[7]

---

6) Italics our own.

7) *"Je ne me le rappelle pas sans horreur. Dès qu'il vit que tout ce qu'il avait fait pour augmenter ses forces avait produit un effet tout contraire, la mort fut toujours devant ses yeux. Dès ce moment, la rage s'est emparée de son âme. Rappelez-vous les fureurs d'Oreste: Furiis agitatus obiit."* (W. Kreiten, *Voltaire*, p. 567.)

Besides the letter to Carl Bonnet we have as evidence Dr. Tronchin's report of Voltaire's death handed down in other publications; for as Tronchin testified in the letter, he also testified orally to his friends at Paris of the horrors of "the philosopher's" last days. Père Elie Harel, in his above-mentioned work, *Recueil des Particularités Curieuses,* etc., offers his account in a special note to the official letter of Abbé Gaultier. As Père Harel witnesses, Tronchin made this report to him personally. It runs as follows: "After the Rev. Father of St. Sulpice and the Rev. Abbé Gaultier had left Voltaire, Mr. Tronchin, his physician, visited him. He entered just as Voltaire was in a most dreadful state. He writhed, cast himself from one side of the bed to another, and cried full of madness, 'I am forsaken by God and men!' Then he reached into his stool, seized rapidly and full of frenzy a handful of feces and crammed them into his mouth. Dr. Tronchin, who narrated this frightful happening before celebrated men, could not restrain himself from saying, 'I would wish that all those who have been perverted by Voltaire's writings had been witnesses to his death. . . . It is not possible to retain one's composure at the sight of such horrible things. One can only say that Voltaire fulfilled the following prophecy of the prophet Ezekiel, of which so often he had made mockery, in himself, Ezek. 4, 12: "And thou shalt eat it as barley cakes, and thou shalt bake it with dung that cometh out of man, in their sight." ' So the old translation of 1785." (Kreiten, *Voltaire,* p. 567.)[8]

Father Kreiten continues: "Let us note that Père Harel wrote and published this note two years after Voltaire's death; yet there was no *démenti,* neither from his "friends" nor from Tronchin, who at that time was still living at Paris. Only *seven years* later

---

8) *"Nachdem der Herr Pfarrer von St. Sulpice und der Herr Abbé Gaultier den Voltaire verlassen hatten, besuchte ihn Herr Tronchin, sein Leibarzt. Dieser kam eben dazu, als Voltaire in der entsetzlichsten Lage war. Er waelzte sich, warf sich hin und her und schrie mit voller Wut: 'Ich bin von Gott und Menschen verlassen!' Alsdann langte er in seinen Leibstuhl, ergriff schnell und rasend eine Handvoll Unflat und frass ihn hinein. Der Doktor Tronchin, welcher diese schauervolle Begebenheit vor angesehenen Personen erzaehlt hat, konnte sich nicht enthalten, ihnen zu sagen: 'Ich wollte wohl wuenschen, dass alle diejenigen, welche durch Voltaires Schriften sind verfuehrt worden, Zeugen von seinem Tode gewesen waeren. . . . Es ist nicht moeglich, bei einem solchen Schreckensbild in seiner Fassung zu bleiben. Man kann nur sagen, dass Voltaire die folgende Weissagung des Propheten Hesekiel, ueber welche er so vielmal gespottet hatte, an sich selbst erfuellt habe, Hesek. 4, 12: "Gerstenkuchen sollst du essen, die du vor ihren Augen mit Menschenmist backen sollst." ' So die alte Uebersetzung von 1785."*

Wagnière raised doubts *concerning the strong expressions* of Tronchin."

One of Dr. Tronchin's oral accounts was published also in the *Gazette de Cologne* of July 7, 1778, which quotes Tronchin as having said: "He reached out his arms and, putting his hands into his chamber-pot and seizing that which was in it, ate of it." [9])

Father Kreiten remarks: "It may seem strange that they should have recourse to a newspaper from Cologne to establish a fact which happened at Paris. Why not quote a Paris paper? Because the French Government had strictly forbidden to speak of Voltaire in French periodicals; they were allowed to say neither anything good nor anything bad. Indeed, even his name should not be mentioned in the columns of the periodicals. The actors were forbidden to enact his plays, and teachers, to assign verses from the 'patriarch's' poems for memory work. So we are informed unanimously by the memoirs of the day, by the correspondence of Grimm, d'Alembert, and Laharpe; by the *Journal du Bourgeois de Paris* of June 2; by the *Correspondance Secrète* of June 6; by the *Nouvelles de Bachaumont* of June 11. We must therefore not be surprised that no one knew the day of his death. Not until June 8 could the *Gazette de France,* the official government journal, register his death, and then only without mentioning the place where he had died. In consequence, most of the news of his death could spread only through oral reports, and since among the actual eye-witnesses of the last scene only Tronchin did not belong to the 'brethren' or was not dominated by them, it is not surprising that most of the accounts refer to Tronchin's oral statements" (p. 569).

Dr. Tronchin's oral reports were guardedly published also in the *Bourgeois de Paris* of June, 1778, which speaks of Voltaire's *"l'espèce de rage et de désespoir."* Yet in spite of these and other publications they were never branded as lies by the "friends" of Voltaire, nor were they ever retracted or modified by Dr. Tronchin, who continued to live at Paris and was in close touch with everything that concerned his former patient. To this day Dr. Tronchin's account stands unrebutted and unrefuted; nor have any "friends" of Voltaire dared to calumniate his character or question his veracity on account of the reports spread about the "master's" death. The blunt old Calvinist continued in good grace even with the enemies of the Roman Catholic Church, the Vol-

9) *"Il se tordait les bras, et portant les mains dans son pot de chambre et saissant ce qui y était, il l'a mangé."*

tairian atheists, deists, and agnostics of the time. Was he so highly honored because he alone told the truth?

3. The third eye-witness of Voltaire's death was *Mademoiselle Belle-et-Bonne,* or the Marquise de Villette, as she was called after her marriage to the Marquis de Villette, in whose palace, the Hotel de Villette, the old rake died. In 1820 she returned to the Catholic Church and then made frequent confessions concerning Voltaire's death to Deperry, who published them, in 1835, in his famous work *Biographie des Hommes Célèbres du Departement de l'Ain."* In this work he quotes Belle-et-Bonne as follows: —

"Nothing is more true, said Madame de Villette, among other numerous particulars, than that which Mr. Tronchin relates about the last moments of Voltaire. He made terrible outcries, he writhed, he stretched out his hands, he lacerated himself with his nails. A few minutes before giving up his soul, he asked for the Abbé Gaultier. Many times, Madame de Villette said, she desired to send some one for a minister of Jesus Christ, but the friends of Voltaire who were present opposed themselves, fearing that the presence of a priest, receiving the last breath of their patriarch, would not foster the work of philosophy and would not encourage the adepts, whom such a conduct of their leader would have condemned. When the fatal moment arrived, a new attack of despair seized the dying man. He cried out that he felt an invisible hand dragging him before the tribunal of God. He called upon Jesus Christ with plaintive pleadings, whom he had fought during his whole life. He cursed his companions in impiety and invoked and blasphemed Heaven again and again. Finally, in order to quench a burning thirst which choked him, he put his mouth to the night-chamber. He roared out a last cry and died in the midst of filth and blood which rolled out of his mouth and his nostrils." (*Biographie des Hommes Célèbres du Departement de l'Ain,* p. 163.)

4. Of the *servants* who later testified to the horrors of Voltaire, the report of the chef of Hotel Villette is the clearest. We have already quoted his confession made to the Abbé of St. Sulpice: *"Si le diable pouvait mourir, il ne mourrait pas autrement."* (Cp. *Histoire de M. Vuarin par l'Abbé Martin,* tom. I, p. 372.)

The report of Dr. Tronchin was also perpetuated in Barruel's *Mémoires sur le Jacobinisme* (tom. I, p. 266) and in *Helviennes,* published in 1784. We shall quote his account as it is transcribed in the *Christian Observer* of November, 1842, pp. 668. 669. We read: —

"It was during Voltaire's last visit to Paris, when his triumph was complete and he had even feared that he should die with glory, amidst the acclamations of an infatuated theater, that he was struck by the hand of Providence and fated to make a very different termination of his career.

"In the midst of his triumphs a violent hemorrhage raised apprehensions for his life. D'Alembert, Diderot, and Marmontel hastened to support his resolution in his last moments, but were only witnesses to their mutual ignominy as well as to his own.

"Here let not the historian fear exaggeration. Rage, remorse, reproach, and blasphemy, all accompany and characterize the long agony of the dying atheist. His death, the most terrible ever recorded to have stricken the impious man, will not be denied by his companions in impiety. Their silence, however much they may wish to deny it, is the least of those corroborative proofs which might be adduced. Not one of the sophists has ever dared to mention any sign given, of resolution or tranquillity, by the premier chief during the space of three months which elapsed from the time he was crowned in the theater until his decease. Such a silence expresses how great their humiliation was in his death!

"It was in his return from the theater and in the midst of the toils he was resuming in order to acquire fresh applause, when Voltaire was warned that the long career of his impiety was drawing to an end.

"In spite of all the sophists flocking around him in the first days of his illness, he gave signs of wishing to return to God, whom he had so often blasphemed. He called for the priest who ministered to Him whom he had sworn to crush under the appellation of 'the Wretch.' His danger increasing, he wrote the following note to Abbé Gaultier: 'You had promised, sir, to come and hear me. I entreat you would take the trouble of calling as soon as possible.' Signed: '*Voltaire.* Paris, the 26th February, 1778.'

"A few days after this he wrote the following declaration, in the presence of the same Abbé Gaultier, Abbé Mignot, and the Marquis de Villevieille, copied from the minutes deposited with Mr. Momet, notary, at Paris: —[10])

" 'I, the undersigned, declare that for these four days past, having been afflicted with a vomiting of blood, at the age of eighty-four, and not having been able to drag myself to the church, the Rev. Rector of St. Sulpice having been pleased to add to his good

10) This point is not mentioned by Kreiten, but is confirmed by others.

works that of sending to me Abbé Gaultier, a priest, I confessed to him, and if it please God to dispose of me, I die in the Holy Catholic Church in which I was born, hoping that the divine mercy will deign to pardon all my faults. If ever I have scandalized the Church, I ask pardon of God and of the Church. Second of March, 1778.' Signed: *'Voltaire.* In presence of Abbé Mignot, my nephew, and the Marquis de Villevieille, my friend.' [11])

"After the two witnesses had signed this declaration, Voltaire added these words, copied from the same minutes: 'The Abbé Gaultier, my confessor, having apprised me that it was said among a certain set of people I should protest against everything I did at my death, I declare that I never made such a speech and that it is an old jest, attributed long since to many of the learned, more enlightened than I am.'

"Was this declaration a fresh instance of his former hypocrisy? For he had the mean hypocrisy, even in the midst of his efforts against Christianity, to receive the Sacrament regularly and to do other acts of religion, merely to be able to deny his infidelity if accused of it.

"Unfortunately, after the explanations we have seen him give of his exterior acts of religion, might there not be room for doubt? Be that as it may, there is a public homage paid to that religion in which he declared he meant to die, notwithstanding his having perpetually conspired against it during his life. This declaration is also signed by the same friend and adept, the Marquis de Villevieille, to whom, eleven years before, Voltaire was wont to write, 'Conceal your march from the enemy in your endeavors *to crush the Wretch!'*

"Voltaire had permitted this declaration to be carried to the Rector of St. Sulpice and to the Archbishop of Paris to know whether it would be sufficient. When Abbé Gaultier returned with the answer, it was impossible for him to gain admittance to the patient. The conspirators had strained every nerve to hinder the chief from consummating his recantation; and every avenue was

---

11) Perhaps Richard Aldington is right when under the title "The Last Days of Voltaire" he writes in the *Nation and the Athenaeum*, Vol. 36, No. 12, December 20, 1924: "He signed a recantation indeed. The reason for Voltaire's temporizing with the Church was not dread of hell-fire [not at that time. — *M.*], but a legitimate desire to protect his remains from the indignity of being cast into the public sewer, the usual fate of those who differed from the Church." [*Sic!*] Richard Aldington is no doubt right in claiming that his recantation was not sincere. But, then, what a lie and what a blasphemy it was!

shut to the priest whom Voltaire had sent for. The demons haunted every access; rage succeeds fury, and fury to rage again, during the remainder of his life.

"Then it was that d'Alembert, Diderot, and about twenty others of the conspirators who had beset his apartment never approached him but to witness their own ignominy. For often he would curse them and exclaim, 'Begone! I could have done without you all; but you could not exist without me. And what a wretched glory have you procured me!'

"Then would succeed the horrid remembrance of his conspiracy. They could hear him, the prey of anguish and dread, alternately supplicating or blaspheming that God against whom he had conspired; and in plaintive accents he would cry out, 'O Christ! O Jesus Christ!' Then he would complain that he was abandoned by God and man. The hand which had traced in ancient writ the sentence of an impious and reviling king seemed to trace before his eyes, 'Crush, then, do crush the Wretch!'

"In vain he turned his head away; the time was coming apace when he was to appear before the tribunal of Him whom he had blasphemed. His physicians, particularly Mr. Tronchin, called in to administer relief, thunderstruck, retired, declaring that the death of the impious man was terrible indeed. The pride of these conspirators would willingly have suppressed these declarations, but it was in vain. The Mareschal de Richelieu flies from the bedside, declaring it to be a sight too terrible to be sustained; and Mr. Tronchin, that the furies could give but a faint idea of those of Voltaire." —

"There is no shred of evidence on which to hang the claim that Voltaire died in terror," this statement made by "friends" of Voltaire is absolutely false. The report of Dr. Tronchin is indeed very credible. His veracity is beyond reproach; his character was unblamable; his knowledge of the last scene was based upon what his eyes saw and his ears heard. There is no ulterior motive that could have prompted a lie in his confidential letter to Carl Bonnet; it was a missive sent by a friend to a friend, who, like him, was interested in Voltaire. Why, then, deny the truth of Dr. Tronchin's statement? *There is no shred of evidence to prove that he was a liar.*

To quote the *Christian Observer* once more: *"The last days of Voltaire exhibit a terrible proof that infidelity affords no downy pillow for the slumbers of a dying man."*

And there the matter rests.

# THE THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER.

**"The Element of Human Freedom" in Conversion.**—In its issue of April 28, 1928, the *Lutheran Standard* says: "But Paul, in Rom. 9, 18, says: 'Therefore hath He mercy on whom He will have mercy, and whom He will He hardeneth.' If one takes these words just as they read and all by themselves, it is hard to make anything else out of them than that God has mercy on certain persons by granting them His grace, so that they can repent and believe and be saved, while He withholds His grace and mercy from others and hardens them, so that they cannot repent and believe and be saved.

"And we have not only this very plain general statement, but Scriptures also give us a concrete case to show just how God dealt with a certain person. The case is that of Pharaoh in the time of Moses, who refused to let Israel go into the wilderness to worship Jehovah. There it is repeatedly said of the Lord, 'I will harden his heart that he shall not let Israel go.' The Scriptures go even farther and make the Lord say, 'In very deed, for this cause have I raised thee up for to show in thee My power, and that My name may be declared throughout all the earth.' This raising up implied in some manner the hardening of Pharaoh's heart. In what sense, then, did the Lord Himself harden Pharaoh?

"We are frank to say that there is something here which none of us can fully explain. It is practically the same question that faces us when we say that all men are alike sinful, that no one can convert himself, that it is God's grace alone that converts us, and yet, when the Word of God is offered to all alike, some are converted and saved and others are not. If all are alike sinful and helpless, and if God alone can save, why are some saved and others not?"

The *Standard* would have done well in not attempting to give an answer to this question and in abiding by its original statement: "We are frank to say that there is something here which none of us can fully explain." However, it offers a solution and continues: "We must reckon with the element of human freedom, with the power of choice. In some manner it is put up to each individual whether or not he wants to be saved. He must make choice of salvation. To the people of Jerusalem Jesus said, 'Ye would not.'" One cannot help from getting the impression from this line of argument, as also applied in the closing paragraph, that the *Standard* argues that, since the people of Jerusalem were not converted because they "would not," others were converted because they "would." — Certainly God does not, from the outset, "withhold His grace and mercy" from any. Why, then, are some hardened and lost who are in no greater guilt than we were? The closing sentence of the article gives the fine, Scriptural answer: "On Judgment Day, God will be fully able to clear Himself that He had no part in the loss of any soul." They have destroyed themselves. To the others God says, without any restrictions or modifications: "In Me is thine help." E.

**Conversio Reiterata.** — The *Luth. Standard* of April 21, 1928, writing on "The Sin of Apostasy," says: "It is thus clear that a fully converted person is spoken of here [Heb. 6, 4—6]. He may not have attained at all to the fullest measure of grace, but he is truly a child of God, and that not only in respect to justification, that his sins are forgiven, but also in respect to sanctification, in that he has made some progress in sanctification or holiness of living. . . . The state, then, that is here described is that of a person who was fully converted, but has now turned back again to his old life of the flesh. He was living unto Christ and serving Him; now he has turned back to serve the flesh, the world, and the devil. From this state, now, the apostle says it is impossible to renew the person, to renew him again unto repentance. These words are terrific; but we shall have to let them stand just as they read. They are perfectly clear, they cannot be misunderstood. For any one to try to twist them from their clear meaning would simply be flying in the face of the Holy Spirit, whose words they are. We might point to persons who had backslidden and were again renewed. But there are always three questions in such cases. One is whether they had been sufficiently enlightened and converted; the second, whether their backsliding was really all that is here assumed; and the third, whether their renewal is an actual renewal in the sight of God. Whatever we do, let us not tamper with the words of the eternal Spirit." Does the writer mean to say that when a really converted person really apostatizes, he can in no case be really converted again? Such a statement could not stand. There is a *conversio reiterata.* Art. 12 of the Augsburg Confession says: "The Novatians also are condemned, who would not absolve such as had fallen after baptism though they returned to repentance." We are convinced that the *Standard* would not refuse to deal with an apostate. We are convinced of this because in the next issue it restricts the cases where a renewed conversion is impossible to those where final obduration has set in. The article of April 28 deals with "The Hardened Heart" and says: "In the preceding two issues we wrote somewhat on the sin against the Holy Ghost and the sin of apostasy. There is another sin that is very similar to these. . . . Thus apostasy is not so much a single sin which one may commit to-day or to-morrow, but a fixed spiritual state or condition into which one drifts by continuously opposing God's grace. It is not so much a sin, therefore, which one commits under the stress of a sudden temptation or in the fit of some violent passion, but a hardened state into which one who had been a child of God grows by either gradually or suddenly turning away from God and then wilfully and persistently resisting the work of the Holy Spirit in His endeavors to bring one back again to a state of grace. It will be seen, therefore, that the sin of apostasy is very much like the sin of hardening, which we wish to deal with here." So the statement of April 21 that it is impossible to renew the person who was fully converted, but has now turned back again to his old life of the flesh must be taken as referring only to those apostates who have finally fallen under the judgment of obduration. E.

**Books about the Bible.** — The *Watchman-Examiner* writes editorially: "In the past few years we have rejoiced in the almost numberless books that have been written about the Bible. These books have concerned themselves with the history of the Bible, the interpretation of the Bible, the characters of the Bible, and the inspiration that comes from reading the Bible. We sound a note of warning, however; good as these books are, it is quite impossible for them to take the place of the Bible itself. Let us beware of reading too much about the Bible and too little *the Bible.*"

This warning is not new. It has been voiced time and again by godly men who viewed the increase of religious books and the corresponding neglect of the Bible itself with alarm. Among others, Luther was most emphatic in deprecating the multiplying of books. Of his own books he said: "I do not wish that my books, especially the earlier ones, should be published; indeed, I would rather destroy them all. For the whole Church is being filled with books, while the Bible is being neglected." (St. L. Ed., XXII, 1080.) Warnings like these are certainly in place in this busy age of book-making.

MUELLER.

**No Indemnity to be Demanded from China.** — After the Boxer Rebellion the Chinese government was compelled to pay an indemnity for the injury suffered by the property of Christian missions during this uprising. Concerning this matter the *Presbyterian* writes: "The fact that missions restored their properties and sometimes beautified them from this government reimbursement made by the Chinese people through the Chinese government has not been so wholesome a memory. It is even pointed out by the natives that the missionaries' claims for reparation revealed a greed not consistent with the teachings of Jesus about turning the other cheek. The *Christian Advocate* announces that Methodism in China will not pursue that former policy following the losses incurred by the recent riots." It adds: "The losses of Nanking this year have been considerable, but the missionary authorities wisely prefer to pocket them rather than to prefer claims which, if paid at all, would be paid under compulsion and would be assessed upon the innocent civilian populations, who are usually friendly to the missionaries and often risked their own lives and property in the effort to save their foreign friends." It seems to us that the *Presbyterian* is justified in endorsing the policy announced by the *Christian Advocate* for the Methodist Church in China.

**Crisis in the Presbyterian Church.** — The *Presbyterian* of March 15 endeavors to arouse its readers to a realization of the gravity of the situation in which the Presbyterian Church finds itself. A crisis is coming, says the editor. The first sign of it is, so he thinks, the denial of certain "constitutional" (*i. e.,* confessional) doctrines, such as the infallibility of the Bible, the creation of the world as described in Gen. 1, and the virgin birth of Christ. A second indication he finds in the inclusivism which is being advocated so widely. This term describes the tendency to keep people together in one organization whose doctrines and principles do not agree. The third proof for the approach of a crisis is found in union efforts of

a very radical kind, like the so-called "fellowship of faiths." The editor says: "An example of this was recently given in Philadelphia, when certain Presbyterian ministers and other professed evangelicals united in a 'fellowship of faiths' with Unitarians, Confucianists, Buddhists, Shintoists, Mohammedans, and adherents of other non-Christian cults." The writer says in conclusion: "A most serious crisis is approaching, perhaps one of the most serious in history, and it becomes every true Presbyterian — yes, every true evangelical — to stand firm with his brethren and resist these fearful forces which seek to destroy men and dishonor God, and by steadfast witness to revealed truth and to Jesus Christ overcome this satanic force to the honor of Christ and to the saving of men." And what does this mean to us? *Initiis obsta!*

**"Crypto-Romanism in the Church of England.** — The *Bulletin des Missions de Saint-André* (a Belgian confraternity) publishes a detailed account of the expansion of Roman Catholic ideas and practises in the Church of England. Guilds and confraternities for the extension of Catholic practises are, it declares, widely prevalent; as, for example, the Confraternity of the Holy Sacrament, the Guild for the Dead, and various Brotherhoods of Our Lady. The influence of the group actually working for reunion with Rome is described as 'enormous' and 'penetrating everywhere.' This supports itself on organizations such as the Society of St. Thomas of Canterbury and the Catholic League. One must accept the *credo* of Pope Pius IV to enter the League, which is a federation of many societies, such as the Apostolate of Prayer, the Living Rosary, and the Sodalitas Pretiossissimi Sanguinis D. N. J. C. This last, the Sodality of the Most Precious Blood, is made up of celibate priests, who engage themselves to use the Roman breviary and to make an annual retreat. Then there is the Living Rosary of Our Lady and of St. Dominic and the Society of Catholic Propaganda. The Catholic League organized in 1926 a pilgrimage to Rome for priests, which included a visit to the Pope. Among the 'intentions' of the pilgrimage were intercessions for the reunion of England with the Holy See and penitence for the schism of the sixteenth century. The pilgrimage took place under the patronage of Our Lady of the Victories.

"In the foreign mission field the dioceses of Korea, Kobe, Nassau, and Colombo are very much under the influence of this Catholicizing party. The late Bishop Weston of Zanzibar, brought up in an evangelical home, became a Catholic extremist. The Swahili breviary and missal used in his diocese were chiefly based on those of Rome."

*Sunday-School Times,* Jan. 14, 1928.

**A Unitarian Hymnal for the American Youth.** — The *Sunday-school Times,* in a recent issue, points out how Unitarianism is being inoculated into the American young people through Unitarian hymns. It says: "The hymnal authorized by the International Council of Religious Education is H. Augustine Smith's *Hymnal for American Youth.* The Century Company describes this as the 'national hymnal for young people.' One should note what is being introduced into

our Sunday-schools. At the end of the book is a section devoted to orders of worship. In these orders the Unitarians have a place certainly out of proportion, to say the least."

After showing how thoroughly Unitarian the hymns and "devotional readings" are, the editorial continues: "One would like to know what the Century Company and the Council of Religious Education purpose in offering this material to the Sunday-schools of America. And in general we would commend to publishers of hymn-books who are filling their hymnals with Unitarian hymns the judgment of the Unitarian Dr. Martineau on Unitarian religious verse. 'In the poetry of the Church,' he says, 'it is the Latin or the German hymns or the lines of Charles Wesley or of Keble that fasten on my memory and heart *and make all else seem poor and cold.*'" MUELLER.

**How Some Brilliant Radicals Teach.** — In the *Presbyterian* of March 1 a graduate of Princeton Seminary describes briefly his experiences at the University of Berlin, Germany. It is interesting to read what he has to say about the methods of instruction adopted by the great leaders of modernistic thought. He writes: "It was my lot to spend a year in Berlin University doing postgraduate work in the Theological Department of the University of Berlin, in the heart of the heart of the world's so-called scholarship. For it is ever the spirit of Princeton to send its graduates into the territory of the enemies of the faith, where their faith shall be challenged at every step. My teachers were men of renown — Harnack, Deissmann, Seeberg, Kaftan. What was my amazement, upon coming there from Princeton, to find here none of that boasted scholarship. I found here no attempt to study a subject from its very beginnings; no attempt to give a complete bird's-eye view of the state of controversy; no attempt to justify a departure from the traditional theology. Each lecturer had no other end in view than to impart his own findings. No one would have guessed from Harnack that such an institution as Princeton, ready to defend the entire trustworthiness of Scripture as a revelation from God, was in existence. What Harnack believed the class could know; but whether he had a right to believe it, or whether he himself had gone astray, he gave them no means of determining. There had been no filing of the complaint on the part of the plaintiff, no hearing of the defense, no summoning and cross-questioning of witnesses, no analysis of the evidence on both sides, no charge to the jury by the judge, — nothing but a biased presentation by the pleader, whose business it seems to be to gloss over his weak spots and to magnify the points which make for his client. I understood then, as I could not understand before, how in a few decades the land of Luther became the nursery of Modernism. No means were given the students by which to measure the trustworthiness of their own teachers."

This all corroborates what we have often asserted, namely, that the worshipers at the shrine of science are often very unscientific.

# BOOK REVIEW.

**Register zu Dr. F. Piepers Dogmatik.** By *E. Eckhardt.* 146 pages, 6¼×9. $2.00. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

This index volume to Dr. Pieper's *Dogmatics* (three volumes) is a real necessity. It very much increases the usefulness of the original work. First of all, Dr. Pieper's books should be read and thoroughly studied; secondly, however, they should also serve the purpose of a ready reference work in the pastor's library. This latter purpose the books could not well serve without an index volume. We therefore are much indebted to the Rev. E. Eckhardt for having prepared it. Our knowledge of his scholarship and painstaking attention to details persuades us to believe that the work has been well done. Those pastors who have the original three volumes on their bookshelves need no encouragement to purchase this index volume; they have been waiting for it. It will, however, not be amiss to use this opportunity again to call the attention of those who are not the happy possessors of Dr. Pieper's *Dogmatics* to its great excellency and usefulness. The Church cannot fulfil its purpose in this world if it has not an indoctrinated ministry. A pastor should first of all carefully and prayerfully study the Bible. For such study a work on dogmatics does not offer, or pretend to be, a substitute; it simply presents the great Bible truths in systematic form. The need and value of doing this is apparent. At the same time a work on dogmatics throws the search-light of Scriptures on old and modern heresies and shows up their soul-destroying errors. All this is very much needed in these days of general apostasy. If our Lutheran Church is to remain true to its heritage and is to continue to serve its purpose in this world, its ministers must have a thorough and accurate knowledge of Bible truth and must be great doctrinal preachers. "If ye continue in My Word," says Christ, "then are ye My disciples indeed, and ye shall know the Truth; and the Truth shall make you free." FRITZ.

**German Gospel Sermons with English Outlines.** By *Adam Fahling.* 428 pages, 6¼×9¼. $3.00. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

As we paged through this new book of sermons on the standard pericopes, we found the sermons to be textual and Christocentric, the language simple, and the presentation clear. A new feature in this book is that to the sermons, which are given in German, an English outline of the German sermon is added. This arrangement will benefit those preachers who cannot use both languages equally well. FRITZ.

**The World Is Our Field.** A Missionary Survey. By *F. J. Lankenau.* 279 pages, 5¼×7¾. $1.50. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

These essays were originally written for the *Lutheran Pioneer.* At that time we read and enjoyed them. In this book they have been considerably expanded. The essays contain a wealth of interesting and stimulating material, as the following chapter-heads show: Progress during the Centuries; Unoccupied Mission-fields; Africa; India; China; Korea, or

Chosen; Japan, or Nippon; Farther India; Siam, French Indo-China, and the Malay Peninsula; The Asiatic Near East; Malaysia, the Philippine Islands, Australia, New Zealand; The Pacific Islands; South America; Central America and the West Indies; Mexico, Alaska; The Indians of the United States; Orientals in the United States; The Negro in the United States; Foreign-speaking Peoples in Our Country; The Migrant Groups; The Southern Mountaineers; The Mormons; Missionary Conservation; The City Missionary Problem; The Old Frontier and the New Frontier; The Country Problem; Safeguarding the Heritage for Our Children; Institutional Mission-work; A Final Appeal. The number of pictures and graphs add much to the value of the book. It is much to be desired that this book be given a wide circulation among our Christian people; for we believe it would help much to arouse our Christians to their missionary opportunities and their responsibilities and increase both their prayers and their gifts for the expansion of the Church of Jesus Christ.

FRITZ.

**Die Kraft des Evangeliums.** By *Dr. F. Pieper.* 48 pages. 20 cts. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

This tract gives in a somewhat abbreviated form the contents of a paper read by Dr. Pieper at the convention of the Alberta and British Columbia District in 1927. The venerable Doctor treats the following propositions: The Gospel assures us of the grace of God and of our salvation; the Gospel brings about our sanctification and good works; especially does it also persuade Christians to make use of the privilege of prayer; the Gospel destroys all false doctrine; the Gospel strengthens Christians to bear the cross; the Gospel takes away the terrors of death; the Gospel enables Christians joyfully to await the Day of Judgment; because the Gospel is such a precious treasure, we pray God that He may keep it for us in all its truth and purity. FRITZ.

**Search the Scriptures!** *VII. The Most Beautiful Passages in the Old Testament Poetical Books.* 32 pages. 15 cts. *VIII. Christ in the Old Testament.* 32 pages. 15 cts. By *Prof. Paul E. Kretzmann, Ph. D., D. D.* (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

These two numbers continue the *Search the Scriptures* series. The titles are self-explanatory. It is a hopeful sign in these sad days of apostasy that our young people especially are taking an interest in Bible study.

FRITZ.

**Concordia Collection of Sacred Choruses and Anthems.** *8. Spirit of God.* 9 pages. *9. Praise the Lord.* 7 pages. *10. Love Divine.* 13 pages. 20 cts. each. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.) Specify "Concordia Collection" and order by number.

**Lovely Voices of the Sky.** Christmas Song. By *James Raymond Duane.* 7 pages. 50 cts. (Published by Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

These musical compositions of moderate difficulty for church choirs contain also solo parts for various voices. — *Lovely Voices of the Sky* is a Christmas song for soprano. FRITZ.